

# The Classical Weekly

Published on Monday, October 1 to May 31, except in weeks in which there is a legal or school holiday (Election Day, Thanksgiving Day, Christmas Day, New Year's Day, Lincoln's Birthday, Washington's Birthday, Easter Sunday, Decoration Day). Each volume contains twenty-six or twenty-seven issues.

Owner and Publisher, The Classical Association of the Atlantic States.

Place of publication, Barnard College, New York, New York.

Editor, Charles Knapp (Barnard College, Columbia University).

Address, 1737 Sedgwick Avenue, New York, New York.

VOLUME XXVIII, No. 25

MONDAY, MAY 6, 1935

WHOLE No. 769

## READING LATIN AND WRITING LATIN ONCE MORE

In Professor Carr's paper<sup>1</sup> we see a professor in a great University, himself classically trained and a former protagonist in the Classical Investigation, advising teachers of Latin to direct their instruction toward the goal of infra-mediocrity in Latin attainment. Despite the heavy dependence of Latin upon Greek through the adoption into Latin of Greek constructions and Greek words, Greek has been almost eliminated from the Secondary School curriculum. Yet no one who is not thoroughly versed in Greek has any right, intellectual or moral, to pose as a teacher of Latin, for he does not know Latin. And now the writing of Latin is to follow Greek into the discard!

I propose to attempt an analysis of Professor Carr's article, and of its arguments in favor of imperfect acquaintance with the Latin language. I believe that almost any one will admit that ignorance of an important phase of activity in any language necessarily implies an imperfect knowledge of that language.

Professor Carr admits one thing: "A practice so widespread and so persistent <as the writing of Latin> must have some value. Twenty-five thousand teachers, more or less, of Latin in the Secondary Schools cannot be entirely wrong. . . ." If the practice has acknowledged value, why rob the pupil of that value? Professor Carr then goes on to state that "... the psychology of learning (which after all is only a sort of glorified common sense) would lead one to believe that one learns to do a given thing by doing that thing, not by doing something else. . . ." The expression "psychology of learning" should connote learning as under the direction and control of some science of the mind. But so great a scientist and scholar as Mr. J. B. S. Haldane has declared that "Psychology is not yet a science". If any man is qualified to determine what is or is not a science, that man is assuredly Mr. Haldane. A remark of the late President Eliot, made in a small company of which I was one, will be forever a balm to my soul: "There is no such thing as the human mind". There are, he continued, some billion or more of individual human minds, to no group of which, however small, can satisfactory generalizations be applied.

But let us revert to Professor Carr's argument that "the primary immediate objective" in the study of Latin is to learn "to read Latin. . . ."—therefore why write any of it? I beg to change "to read Latin. . . ."

<sup>1</sup>For this paper see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 28.129-133 (March 4, 1935). Comments on the paper have been made by Professor Riess (133-134), Professor Goodale (134-136), Professor Knapp (137-140), and Professor Hahn (140-142). C. K. >

into 'to read Latin fluently and perfectly. . . .' Reading and writing a language are not different things: they are phases of the same thing—mastery—, and are mutually interdependent. Professor Carr certainly reads—and by 'reads' I of course mean 'translates'—Latin fluently and perfectly. Being of mature years, he naturally was trained in 'Latin prose composition', of the superfluity of which in the curriculum he pursued, and of the deleterious effects of which upon his mind and upon his subsequent career in Latin he had then no inkling. Is he prepared to claim *now* that he now reads Latin less well than he would read Latin if he had never written any Latin?

Professor Carr insists that one learns to read a language by reading it, not by writing it. This is pure sophistry. The evidence set forth in support of the above dictum is that "many persons read *quite well* <the italics are mine> languages which they can scarcely write at all. . . ." Is the aim, then, of instruction in Latin and of study of Latin to read Latin merely "quite well", that is in mediocre, commonplace fashion—or to read Latin fluently and perfectly, that is, to master it? Besides, the languages which "many persons read quite well" are not, like the Latin, highly inflected languages. The attempt to acquire an adequate vocabulary in the study of an inflected language by recognition alone is utterly futile and foredoomed to failure. It *might* result not too badly in English, whose inflectional system is rudimentary, or rather a barely surviving remnant. It might work in Chinese, which has no inflections at all except tonal inflections, so that the 'recognition' would have to be aural as well as visual. But to learn by recognition alone the somewhat numerous and utterly dissimilar forms of *sum*, or of *gero*, or of *fero*—or even, to pass to a simpler language, of *pouvoir*, or *savoir* or *vivre*—is a fantastic impossibility. Words and their inflections are the tools the student of Latin must regard as absolutely necessary media of expression, both by the author whose work he is reading and by himself, and he can never *know* them until he can reproduce them flawlessly. To learn to reproduce them flawlessly he must *use* them in writing.

That "thousands of human beings all about us are living useful and literate lives without being conscious that there is such a thing as grammar" I deny. They lead useful lives, certainly (at least some of them); but literate? Well, definitions of literacy, and conceptions thereof, sometimes differ.

"... grammar", says Professor Carr, "at any rate so far as one's native language is concerned, is of little or no use in every day life. . . ."!! The French Academy

disagrees; witness this august body's annual 'legalizations' of new locutions and constructions which have become current in the rapidly developing French language.

With the medieval Grammars I am not concerned. To quote Professor Jespersen's animadversions upon the study of grammar in the Middle Ages and apply them to twentieth-century conditions is beside the mark. I freely grant that grammar should be regarded merely as statement of facts observed. Horace recognizes this in his famous expression (*Ars Poetica* 71-72), *si volet usus, quem penes arbitrium est et ius et norma loquendi*. Now *ius* is a strong word: so is *norma*. Horace was a great and authoritative poet—lyric, satiric, didactic. English is developing as a living organism; and its grammar is not the same as it was in the days of Chaucer or even in those of Shakespeare. French is developing as a living organism, a fact which is recognized and, in a measure, controlled in the proceedings of the French Academy. The Latin of Horace's day was developing as a living organism, and the *normae* he recognized were quite different from those of Petronius. But the Latin of the Golden Age is now our Latin norm. It is not developing, for it is not a living organism. But to read it, we must *know it*, as the French say, *par coeur*, its words, its inflections, its idioms, its syntax. Latin inflections and idioms and syntax constitute Latin grammar.

Objections are made by Professor Carr to the present-day form in which Latin grammar is presented. How else could it be presented unless the Grammar itself were written in Latin—simplified Latin, easily 'recognized'? I admit that present-day Latin Grammars serve as guides for writing Latin as well as for reading it. But I cannot imagine a Latin Grammar which would aid a pupil to read Latin and yet be of no use whatever for writing it, if one should wish to write it. Such a Grammar seems to be Professor Carr's ideal. Will he mention one? Will he write one? I wish he might: I am eager to see it. So long as  $x = y$ ,  $y = x$ , these equations are indiscriminately interchangeable, and the same truth is expressed by either form. Similarly, 'as if' = *quasi* with the subjunctive is *exactly* the same as 'quasi' with the subjunctive = *as if*. So in this case the information contained in a 'Grammar for reading' will be available for writing as well. Precisely the same thing is true for the other grammar rule windmills which Professor Carr sets up at which to tilt: verily it is a poor rule that won't work both ways. By the same token, a Grammar good for reading only would be a poor Grammar. If a rule as phrased can function doubly, why should that rule be so limited, so emasculated that it shall function only singly? One might think it a pedagogic crime to indicate to a pupil how he might properly write a Latin sentence. Let us consider, for a moment, one of these offending rules: "... **Rule for the Infinitive Object Clause.** *The verbs iubeo, command; cupio, wish; veto, forbid, and the like are often followed by <sic> an infinitive clause as object*". While I consider the rule poorly phrased, my objections to it are not the same as Professor Carr's. I confess that this rule appears to me to be designed by its author to indicate exclusively what construction

may be expected by the pupil to be found depending upon *iubeo*, *cupio*, or *veto* when he meets one of these words in a Latin sentence. If the pupil happens to be able to deduce from the rule that he should use a Latin infinitive to depend upon *iubeo*, *cupio*, or *veto* when he is employing these verbs in writing a sentence in Latin, that is his good luck for being intelligent.

Professor Carr is led to "wonder what proportion of the material in our Latin Grammars is directly useful *only* <the italics are mine> for writing or speaking Latin..." I have been reasonably familiar with Latin Grammars for quite a while, and my reply to the above <indirect> question is 'None of it'. How can a pupil 'read'—that is, intelligently translate—Latin involving tense-sequence unless he is taught something about tense-sequence? How can he properly translate a *cum*-clause unless he has some inkling of the various species of *cum*-clauses and of the general slipperiness of that conjunction and has some knowledge of its various significations?

Then the question is directly asked: "...Is it not possible that the effort commonly directed to learning to reproduce the declensions and the conjugations could be reduced to learning to recognize and interpret some one hundred inflectional endings?" My reply is, *Absolutely no!* But why should the effort be reduced? Idleness and lack of concentration seem to be the order of the day in pedagogy. The following incident, for the truth of which I vouch, is a fair illustration of a prevalent attitude on the part of the young to-day. A boy whose parents noted with apprehension his growing laziness was told by his father on the approach of the Summer vacation that he must get a job and earn his own expenses for the summer months. He got the job. His pastor, my informant, asked him somewhat later, "How are you getting on, Archie?" "Oh, I'm getting on all right. But do you know, Doctor, I consider any kind of work a bad habit?" The boy was a true product of that modern pedagogy which seeks to reduce 'effort'.

What about training pupils in Latin by attempting to have them "recognize and interpret some one hundred inflectional endings"? In what a hopeless mess pupils so 'trained' would soon find themselves! The termination of the genitive case in the singular of Declension 3 is *-is*. Imagine their first contact with *itineris*. They would comb the Vocabulary—until they had used up their quota of 'effort'—to find a nominative *itiner*. Similar pitfalls abound in Latin, as in every other inflected language. Paradigms *must* be an integral part of one's mental equipment for the study of any foreign language. The mere ability to 'recognize and interpret' endings would be efficacious only in a language void of all irregularity. Since none such exists, the attempt to develop such impossible ability will result in imperfection, sloppiness, ignorance. While I am on the subject of Latin inflections, I confess that I am utterly ignorant of what English-to-Latin inflections are (Professor Carr speaks of "...English-to-Latin inflection drill..."). I had always supposed that the inflections of the Latin language belonged peculiarly and exclusively to Latin.

Again, we read of "the learning of fine distinctions in case, tense, and mood usages which have little or no value except to guide pupils in writing Latin". If these so-called fine distinctions in case, tense, and mood are valueless for reading Latin, why do they exist in Latin? They occur on every page of the Latin literature that pupils are called upon to read. The writers of the Latin Classics used them constantly. They are an integral part of the Latin language. They mean something. How is the pupil to translate the text containing them unless he knows them, and how shall he know them except he be taught them? Every one of these delicate constructions has a meaning and a force which must be brought out in the English into which they are to be rendered. If they are not brought out by a translator, that translator is crassly ignorant of the Latin tongue—or a very indifferent or careless workman.

Concerning the question propounded relative to the proportion of time to be devoted to writing Latin, what is proved by the great variation of replies made to it by teachers? To my mind, one of two things is proved, either that the replies of the teachers were valueless, or that the question was. The claim is made that these teachers were "experienced". An 'experienced' teacher is merely one who has taught a long time, perhaps poorly. But how much Latin did these teachers know? We all know that hundreds of Secondary School teachers are 'teaching' Latin to-day <and other subjects, too. C. K. > who have no adequate knowledge of their subject, and therefore no moral right to teach it. We know, too, that hundreds are annually being graduated from Schools of Education who are saturated with 'method' of teaching a subject of which their actual knowledge is a minimum. Yet the reply of such a teacher to any questionnaire weighs equally with that of one deeply versed in his subject. *A propos* of the qualifications of teachers of Latin, the following statement may perhaps gladden the hearts of those who believe in reading only, even as it saddens the hearts of such teachers and executives as still believe in the mastery of a subject by one who essays to teach it. For a number of years it was my fate to preside as chairman at the periodic examinations of candidates for teaching positions in Latin in the Senior High Schools of Philadelphia. A question was always set in 'Latin prose composition'. In at least sixty per cent of the papers returned the Latin written was atrocious. On one occasion I was chosen to mark the Latin papers of candidates for Junior High Schools—that educational farce. My recollection is that the highest mark earned by any candidate was twenty-five per cent. I was never again called to serve in connection with such Junior High School examinations! Into the teachers' opinions of the 'values' of writing Latin I shall not venture. Time and space forbid. I will merely say that I consider practice in writing Latin of cardinal importance. I consider the teacher or the pupil who cannot correctly write simple narrative Latin ignorant of the Latin language.

I shall, however, briefly discuss the weight given to 'Latin prose composition' in the College Entrance Board examinations. For about twelve years I was

annually a reader in Latin for the Board. I was also a member, in different years, of the Question Committee or of the Revision Committee. Sometimes my assignment was to prepare the questions in 'Latin composition'. It never occurred to me that my questions or those of any other examiner who drew that assignment "bulked large" in proportion to the other sections of the examination. The interpretation of thirty per cent weight as bulking large is interesting. Professor Carr knows perfectly well that, if the weight assigned to 'Latin prose composition' should be materially lightened, the candidates would simply omit this portion of the examination and preparation for it, and would trust to luck to obtain a passing mark without it. This could then easily be done. But possibly that is exactly what the educationists, in their zeal for infra-mediocrity, desire. They would thus automatically manufacture premises from which to conclude that writing Latin is worthless.

Professor Carr turns now to alleged "scientific studies" of the questions of the time to be devoted to the writing of Latin, and to the best teaching technique. If any one phase of the science of education bulks large with the educationist, it is "technique". Yet no School of Education can tell any teacher who knows his subject, possesses a commanding personality, and loves his work how to teach. Teaching is personality, inspiration, love applied to the imparting of knowledge from an inexhaustible store of intellectual capital. A teacher thus equipped will devise for himself a brilliant and forceful method. The methods of no two such teachers will be the same. Method, exaggerated as it has come to be, is the curse of our modern educational system. Ask any group of teachers who are being daily dragooned and 'psychologized' by this or that Superintendent, or Assistant Superintendent, or Director of Educational Research, *et id genus omne*, what they think of being told exactly *how* to present to members of their classes *subjects of which the dictating authorities themselves are woefully ignorant*, and what they think of the restrictions laid upon their personalities and enthusiasms and judgments. The replies would close every School of Education in the land. Yet the "educational politicians" have laid a strangle hold upon the Schools throughout the nation. "Educational politicians", by the way, is an expression I derive from a recent editorial in a leading Philadelphia daily paper.

The abilities involved in reading a language, Professor Carr claims, are in closer relationship to the abilities involved in recognizing forms than to those involved in writing the language. Well, even if this is true, what of it? Why should not pupils have *both* sets of abilities developed, instead of having one of them atrophied through disuse? The pupils surely would become more cultivated, more logical, better men and women, and, through the cultivation of *all* their talents, more fully equipped to meet the problems of life.

I shudder to think of the probable average mentality of pupils two generations hence, if the educationists have their unchecked way in their wild ride towards mediocrity and even lower levels. Lighten the burden on the minds of the young is the cry. Spare the necessity



for effort. Substitute promotion for attainment. If that be done, the minds of the young will soon fail to bear even the trifling burdens laid upon them. Effort will dissipate into thin air. Attainment will be zero. A dismal picture, nonsense, a Jeremiad, the educationist will shout. I have seen the decline in Public High School pupils, in a little more than a decade: it is ominous of worse.

We must experiment, the educationist declares. We must have 'controlled groups'—and intellects out of control. That educational 'experiments' are wholly wrong and ultimately disastrous is my confirmed belief. Are the experimenters going to condemn entire groups to perform tasks of whose futility the said experimenters are convinced, simply for the grim satisfaction of saying 'We told you so'? What harm does writing wreak upon its victim? Was Joseph Addison a poorer writer of English because of his profound knowledge of Latin? Would *Paradise Lost* have been a nobler epic had John Milton been unable to write Latin as he did? Why are we ever being forced down hill, driven toward the mediocre and the futile? The time is even now arrived when young men and young women who strive with all the energy of their being to attain perfection are deemed *lusus naturae* and showered with uncomplimentary epithets. This is educational progress!!

The proposal is frankly made to lighten the present-day remnant of Latin courses in our Schools in order to meet competition from 'snap' courses. Make of Latin a 'snap' to compete with other 'snaps'! My own proposal is to eliminate fads and fancies and 'snaps' from the curriculum. High School boys and girls are no more qualified to select the proper mental pabulum for adolescents than a three-year-old boy is qualified to indulge his unrestricted appetite at table. The three-year-old will push away cereal and spinach and reach for ice cream and pickles. Let those who consider themselves appointed by God to direct the minds of the young *direct* them, not cater to them.

Among the devices suggested in order to obviate the labor of doing a bit of thinking is to write Latin from dictation. But to do this, the pupil must understand, at least fairly well, *what* is dictated. That is a step toward spoken Latin. Copying is proposed. A truly valuable exercise it would be to sit down and copy a paragraph or two from Caesar or Cicero! Would copying a Vedic hymn in Devanagari characters tend to convey a knowledge of Sanskrit? Again 're-writes' are recommended. If I understand the term, it may be defined as doing execrably what has previously been done magnificently.

The talk of making the writing of Latin an end rather than a means is another bit of sophistry, suggesting, on the chance of prejudicing the entire case for 'Latin prose composition', what is never even remotely considered. No teacher, not even the wildest enthusiast for Latin writing, expects pupils ever to write Latin literature. He does expect them to use their brains to reason with—a brain function rapidly going out of vogue—and nothing more rigorously compels the exercise of memory, selective judgment, and reason than writing Latin. I reluctantly admit that a very few Schools do exist in

which marks in Latin are given exclusively on the results of tests in prose composition. I consider the practice barbaric and grossly unfair. I have myself known but one such School in all my experience. Such Schools should be forced to change their practice. As to its being easier to set and mark tests in prose composition than tests in text, forms, and syntax, I have always found the truth to be quite the reverse.

With the suggestion to the College Entrance Examination Board to eliminate Latin Composition from Cp. 4 in order to lure to an extra year of Latin those to whom all brain-activity is a bad habit, I am wholly out of sympathy. The fact that the suggestion is made ostensibly in order to secure greater attention to literary appreciation is in the nature of a smoke screen. No teacher who has himself a spark of literary appreciation fails daily to plant that spark in the minds and the hearts of his pupils. Every teacher who is a competent literary critic uses this critical power constantly. One who is not such a critic cannot in an eternity of opportunity and extra periods kindle the critical spark in the minds and the souls of the pupils. This literary appreciation is urged in substitution for what? "Writing Ciceronian prose"! Did Professor Carr ever see, among Latin exercises produced by fourth-year pupils, a single one which even remotely suggested the rhetoric and periods of Cicero? This cannot be twisted into another argument against writing Latin. Professor Carr no doubt believes in practicing the writing of English. Did he ever see an English theme which even remotely resembled a single line or passage of Shakespeare?

Finally, does the gentleman who has thus severely criticised the writing of Latin drive an automobile? If so, does he know anything about its structure and repair? Can he find the causes of faulty performance? Fortunate indeed is he if he can. If he cannot, how many times has he wished that he could, and that he had been taught the structure of his machine and the proper tools with which to work upon it.

Well, the teaching of 'Latin prose composition' is simply teaching an unskilled workman how to use his tools.

ST. PETERSBURG, FLORIDA

B. W. MITCHELL

## REVIEW

Agrippa's Building Activities in Rome. By Frederick W. Shipley. Washington University Studies, New Series, Language and Literature, No. 4 (St. Louis, 1933). Pp. 97. 4 Plans. \$1.25.

By a curious coincidence, four studies have recently appeared, almost simultaneously, dealing with the career of Marcus Agrippa, whose important contributions

<sup>1</sup>The contents of the monograph are as follows: Preface (3-4); Table of Contents (5); Key to Abbreviated Titles Used in Bibliographical References (7-8); Introduction (9-15); Group I, Agrippa's Public Works as Aedile—The Sewers and Aqueducts (19-34); Group II, Agrippa's Buildings in the Campus Martius in Region IX (37-68: the buildings include the Saepia, the Diribitorium, the Porticus Argonautarum and Basilica Neptuni, the Baths, the Horti, the Stagnum, and the Euripus, the Pantheon, Sepulcrum Agrippae, the Pons Agrippae); Group III, The Campus Agrippae and the Porticus Vipsania in Region VII (73-77); Group IV, The Horrea Agrippiana (Reg. VIII); The Hydra of the Lacus Servilius (Reg. VIII); Decorations of the Circus (Reg. XI) (81-85); Appendix (89-93); Index (95-97).

to the establishment and the organization of the Roman Empire had long been neglected by students of that fascinating period which witnessed the death agonies of the effete 'Republic' and the birth of the monarchy which rose out of its ruins. First in date of publication was my biography of Agrippa<sup>2</sup>. Shortly afterwards appeared Dr. Daniel's dissertation on the same subject<sup>3a</sup>. Although I attempted to include in my study every piece of evidence bearing upon the life of Agrippa, I did not consider it essential to discuss at great length the many problems concerning the portraits of Agrippa and concerning his great building programme in Rome. Very felicitous, therefore, was the timely appearance of a learned study by Professor Curtius of the portraiture of Agrippa<sup>3</sup>, and of Professor Shipley's monograph on Agrippa's building activities in Rome.

The study under review is, Professor Shipley announces (3), "... the second of a series of articles dealing with the rebuilding of Rome in the period from the death of Caesar to the death of Augustus. . . ." The first in this series, published in 1931<sup>4</sup>, contained a valuable chronological survey of the building operations in Rome from 44 B. C. to 14 A. D., and a study, from a novel and interesting point of view, of the constructions of the *triumphales* (except Augustus) during that period. Death cut short Caesar's magnificent plans for the adornment of Rome, and, during the decade or so of civil strife which followed, although construction did not cease, there was no unified building programme. Caesar's policy was revived on a more magnificent scale by Augustus, who was later able to look back on his work and say that he had found Rome a city of brick and left it a city of marble. It was in large measure to his self-effacing friend and collaborator that Augustus owed the fulfillment of his ambitious project. As Professor Shipley emphasizes in his brief outline (9-12) of the military career of Agrippa, although Agrippa consistently refused to accept the triumphs offered to him by the Senate at the request of Augustus, he contributed more to the adornment of Rome, from the booty which fell to his share in his numerous successful campaigns<sup>5</sup>, than any of the *triumphales* (except Augustus).

After giving a valuable chronological summary (13-15) of the building operations of Agrippa in Rome, Professor Shipley devotes the first chapter to the celebrated aedileship (33 B. C.) of Agrippa, and especially to the aqueducts which at that time he constructed and

repaired. For a definitive treatment of Agrippa's great services to the water supply of Rome, and particularly of the two new aqueducts which he constructed for Rome (Aqua Iulia, Aqua Virgo) one may now consult the important study, by Dr. E. B. Van Deman<sup>6a</sup>, on the construction of the Roman aqueducts. The late Dr. Thomas Ashby's researches on the same subject are still awaiting publication. In the meanwhile, Professor Shipley might have found valuable material in Herschel's useful commentary on Frontinus<sup>6</sup>. In discussing Agrippa's cleansing and repairing of the drainage system of Rome, Professor Shipley, referring to Pliny, H. N. 36.104, *mirabantur... cloacas, opus omnium dictu maximum, subfossis montibus atque, ut paulo ante retulimus, urbe pensili subterque navigata M. Agrippae in aedilitate post consulatum. . .*, maintains (22), with Platner-Ashby, 126<sup>7</sup>, that Pliny may have discussed a reconstruction by Agrippa of the *cloacae* "... in a passage, now lost, to which he refers in the words 'ut paulo ante retulimus. . .'" But one has only to glance back to Pliny, H. N. 36.94 *Legitur et pensilis hortus, immo vero totum oppidum Aegyptiae Thebae. . .*, to see that Pliny is simply referring to his bizarre expression *urbe pensili*. The evidence upon which Professor Shipley suggests (22-23) that a large sewer, still only partially explored, from Via Paganica to the Ponte Garibaldi, may have been built by Agrippa is very weak. It seems to me a mistake in judgment to accept, as Professor Shipley does (27-28), the date of a scissors-and-paste historian like Dio for the construction of the Aqua Iulia (40 B. C.) in preference to the date given by a specialist like Frontinus (33 B. C.). Dio may have confused the praetorship of Agrippa (40 B. C.) with his aedileship, or, as Gardthausen has suggested<sup>8</sup>, the Aqua Iulia may have been begun in 40 B. C. and completed in 33 B. C.<sup>9</sup> No mention is made by Professor Shipley of the fragmentary inscription<sup>10</sup> which may record some repairs made by Agrippa during his aedileship.

By far the best chapter in Professor Shipley's study is Chapter II, in which the famous group of structures in Regio IX in the Campus Martius, the Monumenta Agrippae, is discussed. These include the Saepta Iulia, the Diribitorium, the Porticus Argonautarum, the Thermae, the Horti, Stagnum, and Euripus, the Pantheon, the Sepulcrum Agrippae, and, finally, the Pons Agrippae. The recent literature concerning the *diribitorium* is reviewed by Professor Shipley (40-43). He is in accord with Lundström's view<sup>11</sup> that it was an in-

<sup>2</sup>Meyer Reinhold, *Marcus Agrippa, A Biography* (this is a Columbia University dissertation, published by The W. P. Humphrey Press, Geneva, New York, 1933).

<sup>3a</sup>Rudolf Daniel, *M. Vipsianus Agrippa, Eine Monographie* (this is a Breslau University dissertation, published by M. and H. Marcus, Breslau, 1933). For comparative reviews of this work and my study (see note 2, above) see Fritz Taeger, *Philologische Wochenschrift* 54 (1934), 1046-1048; F. Münzer, *Gnomon* 10 (1934), 314-318.

<sup>3</sup>Ludwig Curtius, *Ikongraphische Beiträge zum Porträt der Römischen Republik und der Julisch-Claudischen Familie: V. M. Vipsianus Agrippa*, *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Römische Abteilung* 48 (1933), 192-243.

<sup>4</sup>Chronology of the Building Operations in Rome from the Death of Caesar to the Death of Augustus, *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome* 9 (1931), 7-60. Compare also Professor Shipley's article *C. Sosius: His Coins, His Triumph, and his Temple of Apollo*, *Papers on Classical Subjects in Memory of John Max Wulff*, 73-87 (Washington University Studies, New Series, Language and Literature, No. 3 [Washington University, St. Louis, 1930]).

<sup>5</sup>Professor Shipley (10) dates Agrippa's suppression of the Pannonian revolt in 13 B. C. My interpretation of Dio 54.28.2 is that this event took place early in 12 B. C.

<sup>6a</sup>Esther Boise Van Deman, *The Building of the Roman Aqueducts* (Carnegie Institution of Washington, Washington, D. C., 1934).

<sup>6</sup>Clemens Herschel, *The Two Books on the Water Supply of the City of Rome of Sextus Julius Frontinus Commissioner of the City of Rome 97 A. D. . . .* (New York, Longmans, 1913). <For a translation, in The Loeb Classical Library, of this work, and my review of that translation see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 10.175-176, C. K. >.

<sup>7</sup>Samuel Ball Platner, *A Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome*, Completed and Revised by Thomas Ashby (London, Oxford University Press, Humphrey Milford, 1929).

<sup>8</sup><Vektor> Gardthausen, *Augustus und Seine Zeit*, 2.608, note 8 (Leipzig, Teubner, 1891-1904, 2 volumes, in 6 parts).

<sup>9</sup>This matter is discussed in my book *Marcus Agrippa, A Biography* 40, note 23 (see note 2, above).

<sup>10</sup>Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum 6.31270. For the various restorations suggested for this inscription see my book *Marcus Agrippa, A Biography*, 48, note 10 (see note 2, above).

<sup>11</sup>Vilh. Lundström, *Undersökningar i Roms Topografi*, 57-88 (Svenskt Arkiv för Humanistiska Avhandlingar 11 [Göteborg, Branas Förlag, 1929]).

dependent structure (not, as Hülse thought, the upper story of the Saepta Julia), although Lundström's attempted identification as the *diribitorium* of the ruins near the Palazzo Farnese, which Lanciani called Crypta Balbi and Hülse called Porticus Minucius, has been rejected by Boëthius<sup>12</sup>. In connection with the thorny problem of the Porticus Argonautarum and the Basilica Neptuni, it is unfortunate that Professor Shipley does not cite for the key passage (scholiast on Juvenal 6.153-154) from Wessner's<sup>13</sup> new edition of the *scholia* on Juvenal. It was on the basis of Wessner's new reading of this passage that I ventured to suggest<sup>14</sup>, with great hesitation, that the Porticus Argonautarum might have been a portico connected with the Thermae of Agrippa. Professor Shipley's discussion of the Thermae of Agrippa (47-53) is incomplete, because he fails to mention the existing portion of the frieze of the Baths, decorated with dolphins, tridents, and cockle-shells<sup>15</sup>, the large block of marble from the Baths bearing Agrippa's name<sup>16</sup>, and Respighi's recent identification of one of the capitals of the *laconicon* of the Baths<sup>17</sup>. Professor Shipley's suggestion (54-55: see especially note 99), that the remains of an *euripus* recently discovered belonged to a continuation of the *euripus* built by Agrippa in connection with his Baths, is unconvincing.

Especially valuable is the section on the Pantheon (55-65), which in its present form, as is now well known, is largely the work of Hadrian. The question of the date of the original construction of the Pantheon has for a long time bothered scholars, because, while Dio Cassius dates the completion and the dedication of the structure in 25 B. C.<sup>18</sup>, the famous inscription on its frieze<sup>19</sup> was inscribed when Agrippa was *consul tertium* (27 B. C.). It is difficult to accept Professor Shipley's statement (57) that from 27 B. C. until his death Agrippa's name would appear on inscriptions with the title *consul tertium*, and his implication that the inscription in question was cut in 25 B. C. The coins which Professor Shipley cites in support of his view bear the inscriptions COS. TER. and COS. III, not COS. TERTIUM (which, strictly interpreted, means 'during the third consulship', not 'three times consul'<sup>20</sup>). There is, in reality, no contradiction between Dio's statement and the inscription. The inscription was cut in 27 B. C., when the frieze was put into place, but

the structure was completed and formally dedicated in 25 B. C.

Lundström's new restoration<sup>21</sup> (which I did not know when I wrote my dissertation) as PORTIC[US] M[AR]TIAE[LEA]GRI of the fragment of the Marble Plan which Hülse read as [MONUMENTU]M [A]GRI[PPAE] may be accepted as certain, though I am not convinced by Professor Shipley's view (58-59) that the Aedes Agrippae mentioned by Suetonius (Augustus 97.1) was not the sepulchral monument built for himself by Agrippa in the Campus Martius, but the Pantheon. An attractive theory (this is, it must be admitted, the one original contribution in the monograph) is Professor Shipley's suggestion (67) that the Pons Agrippae was built to carry the Aqua Virgo from Regio IX across the Tiber to Regio XIV<sup>22</sup>. The only difficulty is that we cannot be certain whether the portion of the Aqua Virgo in Regio XIV was built by Agrippa or at a later time.

In his study of Group IV Professor Shipley presents the evidence for several miscellaneous constructions of Agrippa, particularly the Horrea Agrippiana in Regio VIII. The Appendix (89-93) contains (89) "... the text of the more lengthy passages from Greek and Latin authors, and also those which are cited more than once".

A discussion of Agrippa's alteration of the course of the Tiber is lacking<sup>23</sup>. It would also have been worth while to mention Agrippa's marble quarries in Phrygia and his tile-kilns in Bruttium, from which came part of the building materials for his many structures<sup>24</sup>.

To those who are meticulous about matters of form and about accuracy of quotation and citation of references it is necessary to issue a word of warning in connection with this monograph. The bibliography (lifted bodily, wherever possible, from the bibliography of Platner-Ashby<sup>25</sup>) is replete with errors. To give the most obvious instance, I note that the great German encyclopedia is cited as "Pauly-Wissowa = *Realencyclopädie des Klassischen Altertums*"<sup>26</sup>; the correct title is Pauly-Wissowa, *Real-Encyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft*<sup>27</sup>. A list of abbreviations for the titles of works cited frequently in the notes is given on pages 7-8. Yet one finds some of these titles given again

<sup>12</sup>Axel Boëthius, *Athenaeum* 9 (1931), 117-121.

<sup>13</sup>Paul Wessner, *Scholia in Iuvenalem Vetustiora* (Leipzig, Teubner, 1931).

<sup>14</sup>In my book *Marcus Agrippa, A Biography*, 75, note 61 (see note 2, above).

<sup>15</sup>See Fritz Toebelmann, *Römische Gebäcke*, 1.67-72 (Heidelberg, Winter, 1923).

<sup>16</sup>*Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* 6.31269; *Notizie degli Scavi*, 1881, 281.

<sup>17</sup>Luigi Respighi, *Identificazione di un Capitello del "Laconicon" delle Terme di Agrippa, Conservato nei Musei Vaticani*, *Atti della Pontificia Accademia Romana di Archeologia, Rendiconti* 7 (1929-1931), 109-117.

<sup>18</sup>53.27.2.

<sup>19</sup>*Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* 6.896.

<sup>20</sup>In this connection Professor Shipley misquotes Frontinus, *De Aquis* 1.10, where the correct reading is *tertio consul*, not *tertius consul*. On two inscriptions the title COS. TERT. appears with the name of Agrippa (*Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* 9.4677; Hermann Dessau, *Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae*, 8897 [Berlin, Weidmann, 1892-1916]). One recalls the well known story in Gellius (10.1.7) about Pompey's doubt whether it was correct to place *consul tertium* or *consul tertio* on the inscription he was planning to put on his theater, which he was about to dedicate during his third consulship. Cicero advised him to settle the matter by writing *consul tertio*.

<sup>21</sup>120-124 (see note 11, above).

<sup>22</sup>Compare Frontinus, *De Aquis* 2.84.

<sup>23</sup>See my book *Marcus Agrippa, A Biography*, 96, note 115 (see note 2, above).

<sup>24</sup>*Ibidem*, 130.

<sup>25</sup>See note 7, above.

<sup>26</sup>In 83, note 11, we find "Pauly-Wissowa", alone.

<sup>27</sup>I list the other inaccuracies in the Key to the Abbreviated Titles.... I reproduce, first, without quotation-marks, and without italics, the form in the Key to Abbreviated Titles....; I then present, in round brackets, the correct form, or the correct date: British Museum Catalogue of Coins of the Roman Empire, Vol. I. London, 1924 (1923); G. Lugli, *The Classical Monuments of Rome and Its Vicinity*, translated by G. Bagnani. Rome, 1928 (1929); *Ephemeris Epigraphica*, Berlin, 1872-(1872-1913); *Eranos, Acta Philologica Suecana*. Göteborg, 1903-(Upsala, 1896-1906, Göteborg, 1907-); *Gnomon*.... Berlin, 1924-(1925-); *Klio*.... Leipzig, 1907-(1901-); *Notizie degli Scavi*.... communicate alla R. Accademia dei Lincei (Notizie degli Scavi.... communicate alla R. Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei);... Tenney Frank, *Roman Buildings of the Republic* (Papers of the American Academy in Rome, No. iii) (Papers and Monographs of the American Academy in Rome, Volume 3); Roscher, *Lexicon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie* (Roscher, *Ausführliches Lexikon*....);... Jordan-Hülse's > Topographie der Stadt Rom im Altertum.... Vol. I, Part 3.... Berlin, 1906 (... Topographie der Stadt Rom im Altertum.... Berlin, 1907); The Year's Work in Classical Studies. London, 1908-(1906-).



in full in the text or in notes<sup>28</sup>, and there is no consistency in the use of abbreviations<sup>29</sup>. Professor Shipley announces (10, note 3) that "(Loeb. <sic> Lib. translations have been used in all translations from the Greek)". Yet (without warning the reader) he has in most cases altered the Loeb translation<sup>30</sup>. That the references and citations were not subjected to a thorough checking is quite evident from the numerous inaccuracies throughout the monograph<sup>31</sup>.

Nevertheless, a collection in a monograph of all the evidence concerning the building activities of Agrippa in Rome is a valuable contribution to the topographical history of Rome and to the history of the Augustan Age. It is to be hoped that future excavations, especially in the Campus Martius, will advance our knowledge of the individual structures of Agrippa. One regrets that Professor Shipley did not devote some space, in a summary, to the broader significance of the building activity of Agrippa, and that he did not elaborate somewhat his brief remark (81) concerning the practical and utilitarian nature of Agrippa's architectural and engineering works. While Augustus devoted his attention to the construction and the repair of religious structures, Agrippa, the practical-minded administrator, was occupied chiefly with structures of a secular and utilitarian nature. If one looks beyond Rome, one finds in Agrippa's building activity the same practical interest, in his military harbors (at Portus Iulius, at Misenum, at Ravenna), his great network of roads in Gaul, his splendid structures at Nemausus (Nîmes), his theaters at Ostia<sup>32</sup> and Emerita (Mérida), his Baths and other structures at Syrian Antioch<sup>33</sup>. All these constitute a

splendid commentary on the character of Agrippa, whose "... Profanbauten... charakterisieren den Realismus des 'selbstgemachten' Mannes, der seine Erfolge und seine hohe Stellung sich selbst und nicht etwa der Gunst der Götter verdankte"<sup>34</sup>.

FELLOW, AMERICAN ACADEMY  
IN ROME

MEYER REINHOLD

## CLASSICAL ARTICLES IN NON-CLASSICAL PERIODICALS

### XII

The Romanic Review—April–June, Pierre Le Loyer's Version of the *Ars Amatoria*, W. L. Wiley ["The Bocage is an excellent illustration of the Pleiades conception of the proper use of the Classics". Points emphasized in this article are failure to adhere to the order of the *Ars Amatoria*, omission of a great deal of the substance of the Latin work, and omission of the whole third book of the *Ars Amatoria*. "... despite many differences, the French poem somehow manages to be an accurate reincarnation of the spirit of Ovid"].

Bulletin of the Rhode Island School of Design—January, Etruscan Art [a series of notes regarding Etruscan art and various objects of the genus, so that "one can still create a very fair picture from material owned in America..."].

Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen—June, Review, extensive and favorable, by Emil Kiessling, of Karl Preisendanz, *Papyrusfunde und Papyrusforschung*.

Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie—July, Ovid und die Trobadores, D. Schedludko [a study of the influence of the poems of Ovid upon the works of the troubadours; parallel passages are given. "Die meisten Beispiele des Ovid'schen Einflusses kommen erst in der Blüteperiode der Trobador Dichtung vor"]; Ulixes am Niederrhein, A. H. Krappe [concerning Tacitus, *Germania* 3, the author says, "... kann ich nur die skeptischen Worte Nordens wiederholen..."].

WILLIAMS COLLEGE

RICHARD P. ELDRIDGE

## CLASSICAL ARTICLES IN NON-CLASSICAL PERIODICALS

### XIII

Bulletin of the Museum of Fine Arts (Boston)—October, A Statue of a Roman Lady, by L.D.C. [announcement, illustrated, of the recent installation of "the grave statue of an elderly woman... All that can safely be inferred about the occupant of the tomb is that she was a lady of rank and wealth, who may have held a priestly function... The technique... suggests that the work is to be dated in the early Antonine period"].

<sup>28</sup>Gardthausen, 1.746 (see note 8, above). Compare my book *Marcus Agrippa, A Biography*, 162–163 (see note 2, above).

<sup>28</sup>For example, William J. Anderson, R. Phené Spiers, and Thomas Ashby, *The Architecture of Ancient Rome* (London, Batsford, 1927) is abbreviated, in the Key to Abbreviated Titles... to "Anderson, Spiers, Ashby", but the title is given more fully three times (53, note 87; 61; 65). On the other hand the full title of the work indicated (75, note 11) by "<Becker: see page 75, line 8> P. 597" is not given anywhere in the monograph.

<sup>29</sup>For example, Platner-Ashby (see note 7, above) is abbreviated, in the Key to Abbreviated Titles... to "Platner-Ashby", but the work is cited also as "<Platner-Ashby> Top. Dict." (23, note 17; 29, note 56), and to "Platner-Ashby, Top. Dict." (31, note 79, 34, note 98, etc.).

<sup>30</sup>Compare pages 10, 20, 22, 27, 31, 37, 48, 56, 75.

<sup>31</sup>The following is a list of the inaccuracies (I follow the same procedure as in note 27, above): 11, note 6, Dio LIV, 25 (Dio 54.24); 12, note 11, Dio <LIII>, 23, 2 (53.23.3); 13, at the bottom, Agrippa becomes aedile, four years after his consulship... (three years after his consulship...); 14 (under 26 B. C.), Dio LIII, 32, 1 (53.23.1–2); 27, note 44, <Dio> XLIX, 49, 2 (49.42.2); 30, note 61, De Aquis I, 19 (1.9); 30, note 73, CIL, VI, 31562 (31, 563); 32, note 86, Mart., VI, 20, 9 (Martialis 5.20.9); 34, note 101, Dio IX, 9 ff. (Dio LX, 19 ff.); 38, line 5, 1000 feet (1000 Roman feet); 38, note 10, Huelsen-Jordan, Top. I<sup>3</sup>, p. 460 (560); 39, note 14, <Piranesi>, Campo Marzio Pl. XXV, Antichità di Roma (Il Campo Marzio, Antichità Romane); 40, note 26, <Seneca>, De Ira, II, 81 (2.8.1); 43, line 15, Athenaeum, 1932 (1931); 43, note 42, Humanistika avhandlingar... (Humanistika Avhandlingar...); 43, note 43, Eranos, 1931 (1930); 45, note 50, Mart.,... XI, 1, 2 (11.1.10–11); 49, note 71, <Strabo> XIII, 1, 9 (13.1.19); 49, note 76, CIL, VI, 9727 (9797); 50, line 1, 334–5 A. D. (344–345 A. D.); 57, note 113, Cossus and Lentulus (Cossus <Cornelius> Lentulus); 60, note 135, Bull. Com., 1927 (1926); 77, note 30, Detlefsen, Erdkarte (Erdkarte); 83, line 15, 300 castella (130 castella); 84, note 23, M. Agrippa quadrigas misit (imisit); 85, note 26, <Livy> XLII, 27 (41.27).

Several passages are misquoted: 25, note 24, Frontinus, De Aquis 1.9; 41, note 35, Pliny, N. H. 16.201; 48, note 70, Pliny, N. H. 34.62; 75, note 17, Pliny, N. H. 3.17; 82, note 5, Huelsen, Forum und Palatin, 51. On page 34, CIL, 6.1253 b is incorrectly said to have been found in the Villa Medici.

<sup>32</sup>The inscription in *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* 14.82 [M. Agrippa Cos., which was found in the ruins of the stage of the theater at Ostia, is in monumental letters. It is probable, therefore, that Agrippa was the benefactor who gave Ostia its theater. I did not observe this in my book *Marcus Agrippa, A Biography* (see note 2, above).

<sup>33</sup>The only exceptions are the Pantheon and his beautiful temple at Nîmes, the Maison Carrée.

Publications of the Modern Language Association—September, *Othello Among the Anthropophagi*, J. Milton French [the author suggests that Shakespeare may have visualized the adventures of Othello from the illustrations on the maps accompanying editions of Ptolemy's *Geography* that were published during the sixteenth century].

Modern Language Notes—December, Review, favorable, by Douglas Bush, of Charles W. Lemmi, *The Classical Deities in Bacon: A Study in Mythological Symbolism*.

Bulletin of the Metropolitan Museum of Art (New York)—October, *A Colossal Dipylon Vase*, Gisela M. A. Richter [illustrated. The decoration includes "besides the characteristic geometric designs and the familiar scenes of the laying out of the dead, two lively sea battles. The vase belongs to the developed period of Attic geometric art and represents its climax"].

The Monist—July, Review, favorable, of A. E. Taylor, *Socrates*; Brief review, favorable, of Milton C. Nahm, *Selections from Early Greek Philosophy* ["this useful book makes available . . . translations of source material . . . from Thales to the Atomists inclusive"].

The Nation—October 10, Brief review, generally favorable, by J. C., of Henry W. Nevins, *In the Dark Backward*.

Die Neue Rundschau—November, Review, generally favorable, by Regina Ullmann, of Wilhelm Hausenstein, *Das Land der Griechen*.

The New Statesman and Nation—October 6, Review, very favorable, by Richard Strachey, of Compton Mackenzie, *Marathon and Salamis*; October 13, Review, very favorable, by E. E. Kellett, of J. W. H. Atkins, *Literary Criticism in Antiquity*; October 20, Review, generally unfavorable, by A. W. Lawrence, of H. J. Rose, *A Handbook of Greek Literature*; November 3, Review, very unfavorable, by A. W. Lawrence, of C. F. Lavell, *A Biography of the Greek People*; Review, generally favorable, by A. W. Lawrence, of E. H. Warmington, *Greek Geog-*

*raphy*; November 10, Review, very favorable, by Peter Quennell, of Robert Graves, *Claudius the God*; Review, generally favorable, by Peter Quennell, of Jack Lindsay, *Caesar is Dead*; November 24, Review, generally unfavorable, by K. John, of Stefan Zweig, *Erasmus*; Review, very favorable, by E. E. Kellett, of T. A. Sinclair, *A History of Classical Greek Literature*.

North American Review—November, Brief mention, favorable, of Henry W. Nevins, *In the Dark Backward*.

The Philosophical Review—September, Notes on the Theory of Ideas, Theodore de Laguna [posthumously published by Grace A. de Laguna]; Brief review, favorable, by Gerald B. Phelan, of Agostino Gemelli et Alii, S. Agostino, *Pubblicazione Commemorativa del XV Centenario Della Sua Morte*.

Philosophy—October, *Great Thinkers: III, Aristotle*, J. A. Smith [a record of the life of Aristotle, and an attempt to convey some idea of his philosophy]; Review, very favorable, by J. L. Stocks, of Constantin Ritter, *The Essence of Plato's Philosophy* [the book "is . . . a highly concentrated extract of Platonism . . ."].

The Quarterly Journal of Speech—November, Review, uncritical, by William M. Lamers, of St. Ignatius and the Ratio Studiorum, Edited by Edward A. Fitzpatrick; Translations, "The Constitutions", Part IV, by Mary H. Mayer; The "Ratio Studiorum", by A. R. Hall.

The Quarterly Review—October, *Dictatorships and Democracy*, J. A. R. Marriott [a consideration of democracy. "The times compel us to readjust our political focus". The war which was to make the world safe for democracy has opened wide the door to dictatorship. Such reactions are not without precedent; the author points out the analogies from Greek and Roman history and comments at length upon them].

Revue des Deux Mondes—November 1, *Vers Cyrene, Terre d'Apollon*, Louis Bertrand; November 15, *Vers Cyrene, Terre d'Apollon*, Continued.

WILLIAMS COLLEGE

RICHARD P. ELDRIDGE